EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Case No.:23-MAG-6928

Plaintiff, :

-against-

TERRENCE ALLEN, : New York, New York

Defendant. : October 30, 2023

-----:

TRANSCRIPT AND STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE GARY STEIN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK BY: Joseph H. Rosenberg, AUSA

One St. Andrew's Plaza New York, New York 10007

For Defendant: FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK

BY: Sylvie J. Levine, Esq. 52 Duane Street, 10th Floor New York, New York 10007

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; Transcript produced by transcription service.

```
1
                 THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of
 2
      23-mag-6928; USA versus Terrence Allen.
 3
                 Counsel, may you state your name for the
 4
     record, starting with the government.
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Good evening, Your Honor.
 5
 6
                 This is Joseph Rosenberg, on behalf of
 7
     the United States. With me at counsel table is my
 8
     colleague from the U.S. Attorney's Office,
 9
     Ms. Chelsea Chisholm, and Special Agent, from the
10
     FBI, Alex Felicias.
11
                 THE COURT: Good evening to all of you.
12
                 MS. LEVINE: Good evening again.
13
                 The Federal Defenders of New York by
14
     Sylvie Levine, on behalf of Mr. Allen.
15
                 THE COURT: Good evening, Ms. Levine.
16
                 May I have the time and date and time of
17
     arrest?
18
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
19
     defendant was arrested this morning, October 30th,
20
     at approximately 7 a.m.
21
                 THE COURT: Okay. Good evening, Mr.
22
     Allen.
23
                 THE DEFENDANT: Good evening.
24
                 THE COURT: I am Magistrate Judge Stein.
25
                 You are here because you've been arrested
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

on a criminal complaint. The purpose of today's proceeding is to advise you of certain rights that you have, to inform you of the charges against you, to determine whether counsel should be appointed for you, and to decide under what conditions, if any, you should be released pending trial.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to explain certain constitutional rights that you have.

You have the right to remain silent. You are not required to make any statements. Even if you have already made statements to the authorities, you need not make any further statements. Any statements that you do make could be used against you.

You have the right to be released, either conditionally or unconditionally pending trial, unless I find that there are no conditions that would reasonably ensure your presence at future court appearances and the safety of the community.

If you are not a U.S. citizen -- and I know that you are -- you have the right to request that a consular officer from your country of origin be notified of your arrest. In some cases, a treaty or other agreement may require the government to

```
1
      give that notice whether you request it or not.
 2
     am required by law to tell you this, even if you are
     a U.S. citizen and it doesn't apply to you.
 3
 4
                 You have the right to be represented by
 5
      an attorney during all court proceedings, including
 6
     this one, and during all questioning by the
     authorities. You also have the right to hire your
 7
 8
     own attorney, but if you cannot afford to hire your
 9
     own attorney, you have the right to have an attorney
10
     appointed for you, and I would do that today.
11
                 Is there an affidavit of financial
     condition in this case?
12
13
                 MS. LEVINE: Yes, Your Honor.
14
                 THE COURT: Do we have that? Oh, I have
15
      it.
16
                 Mr. Allen, I have before me a financial
17
      affidavit that I'm holding up that appears to bear
18
     your signature under penalty of perjury.
19
                 Sir, is that, in fact, your signature on
20
     the financial affidavit?
21
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
22
                 THE COURT: Please be aware that if
23
     you've made any false statements in this affidavit,
24
     you can be charged with perjury.
25
                 Do you understand that?
```

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Based on the statements 3 you've made in the financial affidavit, I am 4 approving your application and appointing Ms. Levine 5 to represent you. 6 I also have before me the criminal 7 complaint containing the charges against you. 8 complaint charges you with one count of possession 9 of ammunition after a felony conviction in violation 10 of Title 18, United States Code, § 922(g)(1). 11 Ms. Levine, have you received a copy of 12 the complaint and reviewed it with your client? 13 MS. LEVINE: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 Mr. Allen, you have the right to a 16 preliminary hearing. At a preliminary hearing, the 17 government would have the burden of establishing 18 that there is probable cause to believe that the 19 crime with which you are being charged has been 20 committed, and that you are the person who committed 21 it. You or your counsel would be entitled to cross 22 examine any witnesses and introduce evidence at that 23 hearing.

If you are in custody, you have the right to have the preliminary hearing held within 14 days

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

24

25

```
1
      of today. If you are not in custody, you have the
 2
      right to have the preliminary hearing held within 21
 3
     days. However, a preliminary hearing will not be
     held if before the date it is scheduled to take
 4
 5
     place, you are indicted by a grand jury or an
     information is filed against you by the government.
 6
 7
                 Do you understand that?
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
                 THE COURT: I will set a date for the
 9
10
     preliminary hearing at the conclusion of these
11
     proceedings.
12
                 Is there an agreement regarding Mr.
13
     Allen's release or detention pending trial?
14
                 MR. ROSENBERG: There is not, Your Honor.
15
                 THE COURT: What is the government's
16
     position?
17
                 MR. ROSENBERG: The government seeks
18
     detention on the grounds of both flight and
19
     dangerousness, Your Honor.
20
                 THE COURT: Okay.
21
                 And, Ms. Levine, I take it you oppose
22
     that?
23
                 MS. LEVINE: Correct.
24
                 THE COURT:
                             Okay.
25
                 And on what basis does the government
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

```
1
      understand it is entitled to a detention hearing?
 2
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, the
     government is entitled to a detention hearing here
 3
     because the crime charged in the complaint, the
 5
     unlawful possession of ammunition by a felon is
 6
     categorically a crime of violence within the meaning
 7
     of the Bail Reform Act under Title 18, United States
 8
     Code, § 3142(f)(1)(A).
                 THE COURT: U.S. v. Watkins?
 9
10
                 MR. ROSENBERG: U.S. v. Watkins. Yes,
11
     Your Honor.
12
                 THE COURT: But this is not a presumption
13
     case, correct?
14
                 MR. ROSENBERG: This is not.
15
                 THE COURT: Okay.
16
                 Mr. Allen?
17
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18
                 THE COURT: I am required under the law
19
     to release you either with or without conditions
      imposed, unless I determine that there are no
20
21
     conditions that will reasonably assure your
22
     appearance in court as required and the safety of
23
     the community. I mentioned that before.
24
                 In this case, the government has asked
25
     that you be detained without bail, and the
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

government is entitled to make that request because you have been charged with what is considered a crime of violence under the relevant statute. I, therefore, must determine whether any condition or combination of conditions of release will protect the safety of the community and reasonably assure your appearance at trial.

In making this determination, I'm required to consider several factors, including the nature and circumstances of the offense with which you were charged, the weight of the evidence against you, your history and characteristics, and the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by your release.

The government bears the burden here of establishing either by clear and convincing evidence that there are no conditions that can ensure the safety of the community, or by establishing by a preponderance of the evidence, that there are no conditions that can ensure your appearance as required.

So that's the framework, the legal framework for this decision.

And I will now hear argument from

counsel, beginning with Mr. Rosenberg.

MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.

The government concurs with Pretrial

Services' recommendation of detention in this case.

This case concerns an individual who opened fire in the courtyard of a New York City Housing Authority complex in the Bronx at 8:28 p.m. on a Thursday night when other people were around. He didn't fire just one shot or two. He fired 13 out to his side, not straight into the air, and then he calmly walked back into the apartment building from where he came. It's only lucky that no one was hurt or killed that night.

The charged offense is a crime of violence under the Bail Reform Act, as already mentioned, and it involves a firearm. And those are factors to be considered under § 3142, and they weigh in favor of detention.

Regarding the offense charged here,
Your Honor, I've already described it, and it's
described in detail in the complaint. The defendant
fired 13 shots at approximately 8:28 p.m., not in
the middle of the night, as he casually strolled
through the courtyard of a NYCHA complex in the
Bronx.

THE COURT: Do you have any understanding, or is there any evidence as to what, if anything, he was shooting at or why he was shooting?

MR. ROSENBERG: Not yet, Your Honor.

As laid out in the complaint, however,
the weight of the evidence against the defendant is
overwhelming. The individual who committed the
September 21st shooting was caught on surveillance
camera doing the shooting, and 13 shell casings were
recovered. And there's also overwhelming evidence
that we know the individual who committed the
shooting is the defendant here. And those reasons
are laid out in detail in the complaint, Your Honor,
but I'm happy to go through them also briefly here.

Notably, as described in the complaint,

Terrence Allen was involved in two encounters with
the police subsequent to the September 21st shooting
that were unrelated -- or one was related. One was
unrelated. On September 28th, he was stopped by
police driving a car that appeared to have the same
characteristics as a car that the shooter from
September 21st had been in just before the shooting.
And body-worn camera footage from that incident
confirms that Terrence Allen was driving the car,

and was stopped and to whom the car was registered, looks just like the clear images of the shooter in the September 21st shooting captured by surveillance camera.

Allen was arrested by the New York Police Department officers based on having been charged in the state with crimes also arising from the September 21st shooting. At the time, he was also driving the Silver Mercedes-Benz that appeared in the -- with -- the car with the same characteristics appeared in the September 21st shooting surveillance video, and it was the same precise car as Mr. Allen was driving on September 28th, same license plate, same VIN.

And there was also further evidence linking Mr. Allen to the crime, including some found this morning during the arrest of Mr. Allen. One feature, prominent feature, of the shooter on September 21st was that he was wearing a distinctive blue New York Yankees baseball cap with a red brim. That hat was seen this morning in plain view as the officers were arresting Mr. Allen in Long Island.

THE COURT: When you say "that hat," you mean a hat that appears similar to the one captured in the video?

MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. It appears very similar. It shares the same distinctive features.

In addition, the silver Mercedes that has the same light, that is precisely the same car as the October 10th and September 28th car was right out in front of the place of arrest this morning.

And it appears -- I submit to the Court that it's exactly the same car as the shooter used in the 21st -- September 21st shooting.

THE COURT: I understand your point in referencing these two other incidents is to demonstrate what you have described as the "overwhelming evidence" of Mr. Allen's guilt of the charged offense, but was there anything about those -- either of those two incidents that goes to the issue of danger or risk of flight, either in terms of resisting arrest or other things that were found on his possession or whatever it is that caused the officers to pull him over on September 28th?

MR. ROSENBERG: I don't submit those facts for that purpose, Your Honor. I'm simply attempting to show the overwhelming evidence that shows that Terrence Allen, the man who sits to my

right today, was the shooter on September 21st.

Talking about danger now. Beyond the offense conduct charged here, which, of course, is very dangerous, Mr. Allen's criminal history shows that he's a dangerous person. This is not the first time he's been involved with guns. He's been arrested for five prior felonies and convicted on two.

In 2018, Mr. Allen was arrested in possession of a loaded firearm and a large capacity ammunition-feeding device. He was not ultimately convicted of those charges, and he pled to a lesser offense in September 2022. But in 2006, perhaps most importantly, Mr. Allen was convicted after a jury trial of a robbery in the first degree. And in that case, Mr. Allen displayed what appeared to be a weapon during a forceful robbery. Mr. Allen was sentenced to an aggregate term of eight years imprisonment, and he was released in September 2013.

Before that, Your Honor, in 1999, Mr.

Allen appears to have been arrested for, among other things, criminal possession of a weapon in the fourth degree. I'll also note, you know,

Your Honor, that we have not yet recovered the firearm used in this shooting, and presumably the

```
1
      defendant, Mr. Allen, still has access to it, and he
 2
     has very recently shown that he's willing to use it.
 3
                 I'll pause there, Your Honor, for any
 4
     questions regarding the government's proffer about
 5
     the defendant's dangerousness.
 6
                 THE COURT: So the two prior felony
 7
     convictions are the 2006 robbery conviction -- and
 8
     what's the second one?
 9
                 MR. ROSENBERG: That was not a
10
     conviction, Your Honor. I'm sorry if I misspoke.
11
     He was arrested in 2018 for possession of a gun, and
     he was eventually convicted of a -- of a lesser
12
13
     offense in 2022 and sentenced to time served.
14
                 THE COURT: So he has ...
15
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah. The second -- he
16
     has been convicted of two felonies, Your Honor.
17
     second is a drug felony that I was -- I didn't
18
     describe the facts of here, Your Honor.
19
                 THE COURT: Okay. When did that take
20
     place?
21
                 MR. ROSENBERG: That was in 2003.
22
                 THE COURT: Okay. I see. Criminal sale
23
     of a controlled substance in the fourth degree.
24
     That one?
25
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes.
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. And then I did want to ask you about this 2022 conviction because I was confused about that. Pretrial Service report refers to a conviction upon a guilty plea; something called General Violation of Local Law. I have no idea what that means. But directly underneath that, it also reports on the same date the plea/verdict was vacated. So can you help me understand what that was about? MR. ROSENBERG: I'm not sure I understand further than what's reported in the Pretrial Services report, Your Honor. I only know what I know from there, which is what the defendant was arrested for, and I'm not representing that he was convicted of that -- those offenses. THE COURT: But he was arrested for criminal possession of weapons. MR. ROSENBERG: He was arrested for being in possession of a loaded firearm and a large capacity ammunition-feeding device as well. THE COURT: And do you know anything more about that charge, other than what's laid out in the --MR. ROSENBERG: I do not.

```
1
                 THE COURT: Okay. Going back to the
 2
      shooting incident, which underlies the charge in
     this case -- and you've explained that it's unknown,
 3
     at least at the present time, to the government what
 5
     Mr. Allen may have been shooting at or why he may
 6
     have been shooting. But I assume you have some
     understanding of where the bullets went. Did they
 7
 8
     go into a wall, a building, tree?
 9
                MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, I don't know.
10
      I know that the shell casings were recovered at the
11
      scene of the shooting, in the courtyard of the NYCHA
     housing complex. No bullets were recovered, and
12
13
     there was a canvas done in local hospitals for
14
     victims and things like that, and none were found.
15
                 THE COURT: But where did the bullets go?
16
     You don't have any understanding of that?
17
                MR. ROSENBERG: Not currently, Your
18
     Honor.
19
                 THE COURT: And you say there were people
20
     around. Could you elaborate on that?
21
                MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
22
                For instance, surveillance cameras --
23
      literally, at the time of the shooting, you can
24
     see -- and there's actually a photo in the
25
      complaint, if you have in front of you, Your Honor.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: Page 5?
 2
                 MR. ROSENBERG: That is image 12.
                 THE COURT: Great.
 3
 4
                 MR. ROSENBERG: There's a -- what
 5
      appears to be a --
 6
                 THE COURT:
                             Page 6.
 7
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Page 6, image 12.
 8
                 The shooter, who the government says is
 9
     Mr. Allen, is circled in yellow. There's a muzzle
10
      flash going off as he's shooting the gun on the
11
      lower left-hand corner of the image, which,
12
     probably, the government should have highlighted
13
     with a different-color circle, is an individual
14
     about 10 yards away from Mr. Allen.
15
                 THE COURT: Were there any other people
16
      in that photo?
17
                 MR. ROSENBERG: What we know, Your
18
     Honor -- not in that photo. But what we know, Your
19
     Honor, is that body worn camera footage from
20
     officers who responded to the scene minutes later
21
     show that there are other people around and they're
22
     talking to other people. So there are people
23
     around.
24
                 THE COURT: Well, the individual in the
25
     photo is, you know, diametrically opposite the
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
direction in which the shooter is shooting. And I
don't want to make light of any shooting incident
where people are in the vicinity, but clearly, that
individual doesn't seem to be in a risk.
           MR. ROSENBERG: The government is
certainly not saying this individual is the target
of this shooting. But, again, Your Honor, I want to
emphasize, it's dangerous to shoot 10 meters away
from anyone, even if you're shooting in the opposite
direction. That's the government's view.
           THE COURT: Yeah. And I realize this is,
you know, New York City, not the cornfields of Iowa,
but you really don't know what was in the vicinity
of -- in the direction of what he -- where he was
shooting?
           MR. ROSENBERG: Not currently, Your
Honor.
           THE COURT: How can that be?
           MR. ROSENBERG: Well, we're certainly
going to investigate further and -- but we don't
currently -- like, we don't know that yet, Your
Honor.
```

THE COURT: Okay. And there is a state -- pending state charge based on the shooting against Mr. Allen?

MR. ROSENBERG: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

The next court -- Mr. Allen has been indicted. The next court date is November 8th in that case.

THE COURT: And what happened? Is there going to be bail in that case?

MR. ROSENBERG: Mr. Allen -- there were bail conditions that were set. Mr. Allen wasn't able to -- my understanding -- was not able to meet them for some time, so he was at Rikers for about ten days. Then he posted bail, and has been out since about -- approximately October 20th.

And I'll just note, Your Honor, on that, as came up in the violation preliminary hearing you were doing before, the -- as the government understands it, the standard for setting bail in the state of New York is different materially than the question before this Court, Your Honor.

And, pointedly, what I mean by that is that the primary focus of the New York Criminal Court's bail determination is risk of flight and probability of return to court, rather than also explicitly taking into account dangerousness, although the defendant's criminal history -- the statutory cite, Your Honor, is New York Criminal Procedure Law, § 510.10.

And although some of the factors to be considered in making a determination about whether the defendant will return to court do -- can be seen to relate to the defendant's, what you might colloquially refer to as "dangerousness," it's not the explicit focus of the Court's inquiry. That's the government's understanding, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You can move on to risk of flight.

MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.

The government also respectfully submits that a preponderance of the evidence shows the defendant poses a risk of flight. This is -- this case represents the first time Mr. Allen is facing federal charges, and he faces a lengthy sentence, up to the statutory maximum of 15 years imprisonment. As already described, the weight of the evidence against him here is overwhelming. The defendant also has a history, although the history is somewhat in the past, of flight and non-compliance with supervision.

So I'm particularly talking here about the experience, in Mr. Allen's case, that began in March 2003 in which he was arrested on a drug-sale offense in March of 2003. He was indicted two

```
1
     months later. And two weeks after that, a warrant
 2
     was issued for his arrest, and he didn't appear
 3
     following that for a month -- approximately a month.
 4
                 THE COURT: He was 20 years old at the
 5
     time?
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes. I believe that's
 6
 7
     right, Your Honor. 21 -- 20.
 8
                 In July of 2003, he was convicted by
 9
     quilty plea. And in June of 2004, the following
10
     year, he was sentenced to a term of probation of
11
      five years. In October 2004 --
12
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm not on the
13
     same page as you.
14
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay.
15
                 THE COURT: What are you referring to
16
     now?
17
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Sorry, Your Honor.
18
     missed that.
19
                 THE COURT: Can you point me to what page
20
     in the Pretrial Services report you're on.
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. 8 --
21
22
     oh, it's on his -- I'm looking at his RAP sheet
23
     right now.
24
                 THE COURT: Oh.
25
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Let me move to the
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

1 Pretrial Services. 2 It's page 5, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROSENBERG: So it says here in 5 October of 2004, which was four months after he was 6 sentenced to a term of probation -- and we know that from his RAP sheet, Your Honor. 7 8 On October 21, 2004, a bench warrant was 9 issued for the defendant's arrest, and he was 10 missing following that for two weeks, until 11 November 5, 2004, when the bench warrant was 12 vacated. 13 In November he was found, and his 14 probation was revoked at that time, and he was 15 resentenced to a term of one to three years for, 16 again, it appears, selling drugs. 17 In July of 2005 he was paroled. And in 18 October 2005 -- so that's three months later -- at 19 the bottom of page 5, Your Honor, he was discharged 20 from parole for violating parole. That's the first 21 line bolded on page 6 of the Pretrial Services 22 report. And it appears at the bottom of the page 23 that he may have violated parole a second time. 24 Furthermore, Your Honor, in the 25 defendant's criminal history, the government would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

point to also an old, but still pertinent, conviction for resisting arrest from 2001. That's on page 5 of the Pretrial Services report. And his RAP sheet indicates that Mr. Allen used -- has used an alias in the past. And, in fact, his conviction for -- his conviction for robbery in 2006, you can see on page 6 of the Pretrial Services report, Your Honor, there is an italicized line in the middle of the page that said, "Arrested under the following name: Tony Green."

THE COURT: Can I see that --

MR. ROSENBERG: In some -- Your Honor, there are no conditions in the government's view, that can assure the defendant's appearance and, most importantly, that can assure the safety of the community. And the defendant should be detained pending trial for those reasons.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rosenberg.

MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Levine?

MS. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I want to start by talking about the timeline of this offense. The alleged shooting took place on September 21st of 2023. Seven days later, on September 28th of 2023, Mr. Allen is arrested in

```
a car stop. He's -- it's for tinted windows or something of the like, and he's released. And the government kept investigating.
```

And then on October the 5th, again, for a traffic-related offense, he's pulled over, and again, he's released, and the government keeps investigating. And then on October the 10th, he gets arrested for this case, for this shooting.

He's put in handcuffs, he's read his rights, he's brought to the precinct, and he goes to Bronx

Criminal Court, where he's arraigned on these exact charges. Bail is --

THE COURT: Not these exact charges.

MS. LEVINE: The -- for this shooting.

For this precise case.

THE COURT: He's not charged with the shooting in this case.

MS. LEVINE: For the actions that were allegedly undertaken in the Melrose Houses in which a gun was discharged on September 21st of 2023.

And, Your Honor, to the extent these cases are overlapping, it's absolutely my experience that the state case is almost always dismissed when the case is made federal or trigger locked, or whatever the word we use for it is. But I don't

expect him to be facing charges in both jurisdictions. I think the feds have now taken this case, and now he's here.

But be that as it may, he gets arrested on October the 10th. He gets charged in connection with the shooting at the Melrose Houses on September 21st of 2021 -- 2023, and bail is set in the amount of 50,000 -- in the amount of a \$50,000 bond.

The government is correct, it takes his family about a week and a half to put together the money that's necessary to go to a bail bondsman and pay a portion of that. Two people had to sign for Mr. Allen with the bail bondsman in the state, and he was ultimately released on October the 20th of 2023, so that was ten days ago.

This morning -- and when he was -- sorry.

Then on October the 10th, when he's arrested, they ask for his biographical information, his pedigree information. He gives it to them, and he gives them the address where he's been living. It was at that address where he was this morning when the feds -- when the marshals went and picked him up because the case had been federalized.

And I say all of this to say that every

```
1
     single piece of that timeline weighs against any
 2
     risk of flight. Mr. Allen was exactly in the
     location that he had provided to the state court for
 3
     where he would be, the address he provided to the
 5
     Bronx bail bondsman. He was exactly where he said
 6
     he would be. And going back before the arrest, all
     those small encounters with the police, if somebody
 7
 8
     wants to flee, they flee. To stay in the vicinity,
 9
     to stay in a place where he could easily be arrested
10
     six weeks later indicates that he's not going
11
     anywhere.
12
                And, Your Honor --
13
                THE COURT: Weren't those encounters
14
     before he was arrested on the state case --
15
                MS. LEVINE:
                              They -- yes. But he was
16
     arrested -- right. But to the -- sorry.
17
                 I quess what I'm trying to say is, he's
18
     been around since September 28th until now for more
19
     than a month. We know exactly where he is. He's
20
     here in the Southern District of New York. He's
21
     had --
22
                 THE COURT: Hasn't he been here all his
23
     life?
24
                MS. LEVINE: Well, that -- that's exactly
```

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

what I was going to say, which is --

25

```
1
                 THE COURT: I'm guessing that's not an
 2
      argument for you, but it's ...
 3
                 MS. LEVINE: It's my -- well, it's my
 4
     next argument.
 5
                 No, but I think that for people who --
 6
      if, in fact, he is the person who did this shooting,
 7
     the behavior subsequent to that, if it was covert,
 8
     if he was not driving his car, if he was not in the
 9
     district, if he was using aliases. If he was --
10
     there are lots of things people can do to -- if they
11
      don't intend to be up front with law enforcement,
12
     and he did none of those things.
13
                 And particularly, over the course of the
14
     last ten days, he's been out on bail in the state,
15
     having put his mother and a friend's livelihoods on
16
      the line for a $50,000 bond. And where was he?
17
     Exactly at home, where he was supposed to be, this
18
     morning when the marshals picked him up. That is
19
     extremely strong evidence that Mr. Allen is going to
20
      follow the rules of bail and -- because he already
21
     has.
22
                 THE COURT: For ten days?
23
                 MS. LEVINE: For the last ten days,
24
     absolutely.
25
                 THE COURT:
                             Okay.
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

MS. LEVINE: And the -- in connection with his bail obligations in the state, one, he had to check in with the bail bondsman. I understand the date for him to do that in -- was -- one of the check-ins was today. As soon as he was picked up, he alerted his family members to call the bail bondsman. He's in extremely close touch with them so that they know exactly what he is and isn't doing of his own volition. And over the last ten days since his arrest, Mr. Allen returned to the life that he has had over the last ten years, and it's those ten years I would like to now talk about.

Mr. Allen was released from state prison on his last -- so his prior felony convictions are from 2003 and 2006. He gets out of prison in 2013. Since 2013, he has had the same kind of job. He's a residential manager at various homeless shelters. Right now, he has two jobs run by two nonprofits that each have their own set of shelters in the Eastern District of New York and Long Island. And he goes. He works 40 hours a week for one company and 20 hours a week for the other company, serving as a residential manager.

THE COURT: Give me those hours again.

MS. LEVINE: It's 40 hours a week at one

```
1
      company and 20 to 22 hours at the second company.
 2
                 So he -- for the last ten days, he's been
 3
     back at work. If he's released today, he can go
     back to work tomorrow. We spoke to his boss. His
 5
     boss is actually the person he was living with in
     Long Island. He said, of course he can come back to
 6
     work tomorrow. We stand ready to let him keep
 7
 8
     working. They've let him keep working for the last
 9
      ten days, and they hope that he continues to work
10
      into the future.
11
                 THE COURT: So they know about both the
12
      state arrest and the new arrest, and that boss, at
13
     least you are representing to me, said that he will
14
     continue to employ Mr. Allen?
15
                MS. LEVINE: Precisely. And --
16
                 THE COURT: Is that the 40-hour a week
17
     job or the 20- to 22-hour a week job?
18
                MS. LEVINE: He's the boss of both of
19
     them?
20
                 Oh, he's the boss at both of them.
21
     guess he's his supervisor at both companies.
22
                 Is that right? Okay.
23
                 THE COURT: Okay.
24
                MR. ROSENBERG: This is a man who sits
25
     before you with incredibly strong ties to the
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

community in addition to his track record at work for the last decade, a job he still has and can return to, and the fact that he's lived in New York his whole life. He's never had a passport. He's never traveled.

He is married. His wife is here in the courtroom. She's raising her arm for Your Honor's identification. She -- they haven't been living together in the last few years. Mr. Allen's been living on Long Island, which is close to his jobs, with his supervisor. But upon his arrest today and discussing, kind of, what federal bail would require, they both want him to go live with her.

She lives here in the Southern District of New York. She lives within walking distance, actually, of the courthouse. And not only is she happy to have him there, we had a very long -- we explained to her that he may very well have to wear an ankle monitor if he were released, that that was going to be part of the package we propose to the Court, that that ankle monitor would have to be set up in her home, that Pretrial Services would have to have an opportunity to, you know, check in on him and follow all the rules.

She's also willing to co-sign. She's a

```
financially responsible person. She has a job, and she's willing to co-sign for him. Also willing to co-sign for him, his mother, whom he speaks to every day. She also lives in the Southern District of New York. She also signed the state bond. She's also a financially responsible person. And then we have a third co-signer who's a friend, who also signed the state bond, and is willing to, again, sign Mr. Allen's bond here.
```

I should say that in addition to his mom, his wife, his friends, his boss, his job, his -- he has one child who lives in the Southern District of New York. He supports that child financially with the money that he earns at this job. And those are robust connections to the community. And we submit that asking those people, the combination of people I just mentioned, to sign a bond would be an important part of a combination of conditions that can be set here.

THE COURT: His job or jobs, plural, are both out in Long Island?

MS. LEVINE: They are.

THE COURT: Where in Long Island?

MS. LEVINE: Huntsville and -- Union --

sorry. I'm so sorry. Huntsville is wrong.

Hempstead and Uniondale.

THE COURT: And how does he get -- or more accurately, how would he get there if he were to live here in the Southern District of New York with his wife?

MS. LEVINE: I mean, Judge, he has a driver's license and a car, so that would be one way. And also, there are trains that go to both of their locations -- both of those locations, obviously.

And look, the -- there is no question

that the allegations in this case are serious. I'm

not going to minimize them, but I -- it is incumbent

upon me, I think, to -- the government mentioned the

statutory maximum, which is, of course, 15 years.

The statutory minimum in this case, of course, is

zero. There's absolutely no requirement,

necessarily, that he go to jail on this case. We

have lots of clients -- I have lots of clients who

have been granted bail, robust bail packages, but

bail in these kinds of cases. There is no

presumption of detention, which I've argued many

times in this court means there's a presumption of

release, that -- and, of course, the question is

not, are -- is there some danger, or is there some

risk of flight? The question is, are there conditions that can be overcome? And so we submit that the following bail package is appropriate in this case.

We submit that -- a \$50,000 personal recognizance bond co-signed by three financially responsible people. We suggest that he be outfitted with an electronic monitor. We suggest that the technology be left to the expertise of Pretrial Services. We -- the next condition would be that he continue his employment, as we're confident that he can.

And, of course, along with the other standard obligations, which are equally important, travel restrictions to the Southern and Eastern District of New York, Pretrial supervision as directed, no possession of a weapon, et cetera, et cetera.

So, Your Honor, this is a robust bail package. It is appropriate for a person who was already released on bail and was found at home in the same location where he previously was, who now has a place within walking distance of the courthouse, where he can wear an ankle monitor with his wife. And the people in his life who have

```
1
     already put themselves financially on the line for
 2
     him are willing to do it all over again. And that
 3
     indicates to Your Honor that there are people in
     this community who trust him. Obviously, his
 5
     employer trusts him. And for all of these reasons,
     there are conditions that can be set here.
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: You focus your argument on
 8
     risk of flight and ties to the community.
 9
     frankly, despite Mr. Rosenberg's argument, I'm not
10
     really persuaded that he's a serious risk of flight.
11
     But I would like you to address the danger issue,
12
     which I think is the real issue in this case.
                MS. LEVINE: Sure. So the -- I think, in
13
14
     my opinion, the sole risk of danger articulated in
15
     the record that I have before me is the instant
16
     offense conduct. And I'm not going to minimize --
17
                 THE COURT: Well, there is a criminal
18
     history --
19
                MS. LEVINE: So I'm going to --
20
                THE COURT: -- that includes firearms.
21
                MS. LEVINE: I'm going to get to that in
22
     just a second. But first and foremost is -- of
23
     course, are the allegations here. I do think that
24
     if the Court were to put him on an ankle monitor and
25
     require, say, home detention with it, which would
```

mean he's home in lower Manhattan with his wife, or in the Eastern District of New York on Long Island, the Court could prohibit him from going to the Melrose Houses in its entirety. You could ban the ZIP code. You could probably ban the borough, I think, if you wanted.

So to the extent that there is some kind of -- whatever led to the shooting as alleged in the complaint, we could remove him from that address, area, people, vicinity entirely with the conditions. So I think that is one important way that the bail conditions can combat the potential risk of flight -- excuse me. I'm so sorry -- the dangerousness that has arisen from the allegations in this case.

with regard to his criminal history, you know, I really worry when the government uses arrest charges instead of convictions, like in the 2018 case, against somebody. All we know about this case from 2022 is that he allegedly pled guilty to general violation of local law, misdemeanor. And it also says that that plea was vacated. There is no basis for the Court to conclude on that record that he possessed a firearm or that he possessed a firearm with a large ammunition device or whatever

the government said.

Arrest charges are just that. They are arrest charges. They don't even have to sustain a finding of probable cause. And so the -- to use that against Mr. Allen in this context I think is -- should not be given weight by the Court.

Looking further back to 2003 and 2006, you are absolutely correct, that the 2006 case is a serious one. And it looks like it was -- it's hard to -- it looks like, yeah, he was convicted of what is a violent felony in the Bronx after trial, and for that crime, he went to prison. He went to prison for, it looks like, up to eight years. He was released on parole in 2013 and then was successfully discharged from parole in 2019.

So I'm not saying those things don't matter. I'm saying that there are conditions that can overcome them. Keep him away from this location entirely, monitored by an ankle bracelet. That's one huge way to overcome the potential danger here. And given all the good things that have been going on in his life and given all of the pro-social connections he has -- and, you know, one other thing.

You know, we talk about bonds as if they

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

only relate -- or co-signers primarily as they relate to risk of flight, but I would suggest to you that they also relate to the safety of the community because Mr. Allen is tying his mother's financial future, his wife's financial future to his behavior. And that has to be -- there has to be some kind of behavior -- modification pressure there, right? That's one of the reasons we ask for co-signers, is so that the people in your life say, I'm on the line for this too. You have to stay out of trouble, and you have to follow the rules, and that includes not committing any acts of violence. So, obviously, I'm happy to answer any questions, but I think that that -- those conditions altogether -- for someone who has a job and has these ties to the community and financially supports a child, bail is appropriate under 3142. THE COURT: And without intending to trample upon the Fifth Amendment, can -- is there anything you can tell me that you would like to tell me about the circumstances of the shooting? MS. LEVINE: I have no information to share at this time, other than, like I said, I

MS. LEVINE: I have no information to share at this time, other than, like I said, I think, certainly, our ankle-bracelet technology can keep him fully away from there.

```
1
                 THE COURT: Mr. Rosenberg?
 2
                MR. ROSENBERG: If the government may,
     Your Honor, so I'll start -- I understand that
 3
 4
     Your Honor is inclined to disagree with our risk of
 5
     flight argument. I'd just like to say one more
 6
     thing about that.
 7
                Ms. Levine discussed that he was exactly
 8
     where he was supposed to be. He's done -- he's been
 9
     around. He's been around in the last ten days.
10
     the -- from the government's --
11
                 THE COURT: I wasn't paying any attention
12
                I mean --
     about it.
13
                MR. ROSENBERG: Okav.
14
                THE COURT: But more compelling to me are
15
     his community ties. He's lived here all his life.
16
     He has a wife, admittedly somewhat estranged,
17
     apparently, but willing to take him back. He has a
18
     job, a significant job. He has no real recent
19
     history of -- in my view, of failure to appear.
20
                 So those are the things that make me
21
     think that the risk of flight argument is not a
22
     strong one. But no, the fact that he hasn't
23
     violated his state bail over the last ten days is
24
     not one of the factors in my analysis.
25
                MR. ROSENBERG: Understood, Your Honor.
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

And I won't belabor the point, but I wasn't intending to make that point. What I was intending to say is that the defendant has not been at his Long Island address since he was released. The government had trouble finding him, in fact. This shooting occurred in the Bronx at a location that it's unclear what the defendant's connection with is, okay.

And he also -- before last night, the government's cell-site location information in real time indicated that for days, the defendant had been at his wife's house -- apartment near the Williamsburg Bridge. So he was there until last night. And agents this morning had to go to Long Island to arrest him, even though that's not where they were expecting him to be this morning.

So there are also multiple addresses listed on the defendant's RAP sheet that he's associated with, including the one on Long Island, to be sure, Your Honor, not including -- and there are two others that are listed. Those do not include the one where his wife lives, and they do not include the one in the Bronx where the shooting happened, where he was going in and out of before and after the shooting. And so there's complication

```
1
     here, Your Honor. It's not as simple as the
 2
     defendant made it out to be.
                THE COURT: And the address he had given
 3
     to the state court in connection with the state
 5
     case, does anybody know what that is?
 6
                MR. ROSENBERG: I don't, Your Honor.
 7
                MS. LEVINE: Sorry. It's on page 2 of
 8
     his RAP sheet. It is the Long Island address where
 9
     he was arrested this morning.
10
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm confused.
                                                        Не
11
     was arrested at the Long Island address?
12
                MR. ROSENBERG: He was arrested at the
13
     Long Island address.
14
                THE COURT: I thought you had said --
15
                MS. LEVINE: Yeah.
                MR. ROSENBERG: No. She --
16
17
                MS. LEVINE: Sorry.
18
                THE COURT: Ms. Levine --
19
                MR. ROSENBERG: Sorry. Can I try to
20
     clear this up, Your Honor?
21
                 THE COURT: Yes.
22
                MR. ROSENBERG: Until last night,
23
     cell-site location information that the government
24
     has indicated that the defendant was not in Long
25
     Island. He went there last night. He was at his
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

```
1
     wife's address or in the vicinity of his wife's
 2
     address in downtown Manhattan for days before that.
     So it wasn't as though he was -- he'd been there the
 3
     whole time since he was released.
 5
                 THE COURT: Would that be a violation
     of --
 6
 7
                 MR. ROSENBERG: No, Your Honor. No.
                 THE COURT: -- his conditions of release
 8
 9
     or whatever?
10
                 MS. LEVINE: No.
11
                 MR. ROSENBERG: But he is -- the
     government is simply making the point, and won't
12
13
     belabor the point any further, that the defendant is
14
     not static and not -- he's been moving around, and
15
     we don't understand exactly all the places that he's
16
     gone.
17
                 I'll just --
                 THE COURT: Why isn't an ankle bracelet
18
19
     enough here?
20
                 MR. ROSENBERG: So -- okay. So, Your
21
     Honor, the government really wants to hit, once
22
     again, the point of the dangerousness of this
23
     conduct, in addition to the defendant's criminal
24
     history, that -- this conduct in particular.
25
                 The photograph that we already discussed,
```

Your Honor -- I understand Your Honor's point that this was not done in the middle of Times Square and there's a photo with someone else in it, but he's shooting the other way. This is still incredibly dangerous, in the government's view.

For instance, as you noted, he's shooting in the diametrically opposite way. Suppose he was shooting at someone. The other person would shoot right back at him and the woman -- the individual is right behind him. It's lucky that that wasn't the case. An ankle bracelet would not have stopped this shooting, or might not have stopped this shooting. It's not clear to the government why those things are necessarily related. Even if you were coming and going to and from work or home, you can still do a shooting in the middle of a public courtyard.

And so, you know, we, again, join the Pretrial Services recommendation, which they spell out the reasons for on pages 7 and 8 of their report, that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure the safety of the community, primarily, but also, in the government's view, the appearance of the defendant.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'd like to take a short break and mull this one over a little bit and come back out and let you know what my decision is.

(A recess was taken.)

THE COURT: I think this is a close case, but after considering the arguments of counsel and Pretrial Services report and the criminal complaint in this case, I'm going to order the defendant detained. I find there are no conditions that I can impose that will reasonably assure the safety of the community.

My ruling does not rest on risk of flight. I don't believe the government has met its burden, even by a preponderance of the evidence to show that Mr. Allen is a flight risk, given his strong ties to the community. But on the issue of dangerousness, and even though the government has a higher burden of showing a danger to the community by clear and convincing evidence, as I weigh the factors that I am required to look at, I do believe they weigh in the government's favor.

Beginning with the nature and circumstances of the offense -- and that's really the most important factor in my mind -- you have a situation where not only was Mr. Allen allegedly in

possession of ammunition, and, although not charged with it, a firearm as a previously convicted felon, but the allegation here is that he used that firearm to shoot 13 rounds in a courtyard of an apartment complex.

There is nothing before me to show that people were -- people's lives were put in jeopardy from that shooting incident in terms of any evidence that there were people in the vicinity of where the shots were fired or anything by way of a motive that Mr. Allen, or whoever the shooter was, would have had to hurt somebody. But it is 13 shots in the middle of a densely populated urban area.

And, frankly, if there was no motive for that shooting, that doesn't make me feel more comfortable from a dangerousness point of view. It may be a different type of danger, but it's still a serious concern of danger to the community if you have somebody shooting a weapon 13 times for no reason.

The weight of the evidence does seem very strong to me, based on the criminal complaint and as described and summarized by counsel for the government. There's certainly no burden on the defense at this point to persuade me that Mr. Allen

is not guilty of these charges. But really, given the record before me, that factor as well, the weight of the evidence weighs strongly in favor of the government.

In terms of Mr. Allen's history and characteristics, I don't think that presents overwhelming indicia of dangerousness, but it certainly does present some. There are several --well, there is a conviction, for one thing, of a robbery in which a firearm, or what appeared to be a firearm, was brandished. And there are additional arrests involving weapons. I wish the Court knew more about them, in particular, the 2018 arrest.

But nevertheless, the fact that there was, sort of, a pattern of Mr. Allen and his involvement with firearms, which appears to be the case from the record before me, weighs very heavily when I consider the issue of danger to the community.

And so I do believe, considering the final factor, that the nature and seriousness of the danger to the community is significant here because of Mr. Allen's past history with weapons and, most importantly, his most recent history with this weapon and this shooting incident.

```
1
                 I have considered carefully Ms. Levine's
 2
      arguments and her proposed package, but I don't
 3
     believe those conditions would adequately protect
     the safety of the community. Even with an ankle
 4
 5
     bracelet, Mr. Allen would be free to move around.
     We don't know where the firearm is. And, again,
 6
 7
     given the nature of the incidents and the strength
 8
     of the evidence, the danger to the community seems
 9
     palpable to me.
10
                 I do appreciate the willingness of
11
     members of the defendant's family and his wife's
12
     appearance here today to support him, but because of
13
     what I've described, I find that, even with a bond
14
     co-signed by the three co-signers that Ms. Levine
15
     proposed, I cannot reasonably assure the safety of
16
     the community. So that is my ruling.
17
                 MS. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor.
18
                 THE COURT: We need to set a date for the
19
     preliminary hearing.
20
                 MS. LEVINE: The 14th day, please.
21
                 THE COURT: Preliminary hearing will be
22
     set for Monday, November 13, 2023.
23
                 Anything further from the government?
24
                 MR. ROSENBERG: No, Your Honor.
25
      you.
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: Anything further from the
 2
     defense?
 3
                 MS. LEVINE: Just one minute.
                 Your Honor, I'm just discussing a medical
 4
 5
     order, which I think I'm going to request from the
 6
     Court.
 7
                 THE COURT: Yes, of course.
 8
                 MS. LEVINE: I'm just going to get the
     details about it.
 9
10
                 Your Honor, nothing further, other than a
11
     medical order that I'll provide to your staff
12
     shortly.
13
                 THE COURT: Thank you. So I will sign
14
     that.
15
                 MS. LEVINE: Thank you very much.
                 THE COURT: Are we adjourned?
16
17
                 Thank you, all. Have a good night.
18
                 MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you.
19
                               000
20
21
22
23
24
25
         AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445
```

C E R T I F I C A T EI, Adrienne M. Mignano, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the case of USA v. Terrence Allen; Docket Number: 23MAG6928 was prepared using digital transcription software and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. Signature Adrisnns M. Mignano ADRIENNE M. MIGNANO, RPR November 15, 2023 Date:

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445